

REASONS FOR EMBRACING HOMŒOPATHY.

BY

CHARLES RANSFORD, M.D., EDIN.,

Fellow of and lately one of the Examiners in the Royal College of Physicians, Licentiate of the Royal College of Surgeons, formerly one of the Medical Officers of the Royal and Western Dispensaries, Secretary of the Anatomical and Obstetrical Societies, Member of the Medico-Chirurgical, Extraordinary Member and President of the Royal Medical and Harveian Societies of Edinburgh, Physician to the York Homœopathic Dispensary.

NEW TRUTHS.—If anyone advances anything new which contradicts, perhaps threatens to overturn the creed we have for years repeated and have handed down to others, all passions are raised against him, and every effort is made to crush him; people resist with all their might—they act as if they neither heard nor could comprehend; they speak of the new view with contempt, as if it were not worth the trouble of even so much as an investigation or regard. And thus a new truth may wait a long time before it can make its way.—
GOETHE.


Extracted from the British Journal of Homœopathy,
No. XXXVII.

SECOND EDITION.

LONDON:

PRINTED BY WILLIAM DAVY AND SON,
GILBERT STREET, OXFORD STREET.

1851.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016

<https://archive.org/details/b28043601>

R55330

REASONS
FOR
EMBRACING HOMŒOPATHY.

The writer of this paper having been known until within a comparatively short time since (especially while holding office in the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh) as a determined opponent of homœopathy and its disciples, and now coming forward to avow his conviction of its truths and his desire to assist by every legitimate means in their dissemination; he thinks it a duty to give his reasons for thus changing his opinions and practice. In common with many of his professional brethren in Edinburgh, he questioned the possibility of the homœopathic preparations containing any medicinal properties whatever; because, in the first place, the most carefully conducted chemical analysis failed to detect their presence, except, perhaps, in some few of the tinctures; and secondly, because even if they did exist, so material and palpable did we erroneously suppose disease to be, it was impossible (so we argued) that substances so attenuated could exert any influence upon the human organism. Still, with all the apparent difficulties and absurdities, (as we styled their doctrines) our patients resorted to these heretical practitioners—and generally assured us, to our ill-concealed mortification, that they received benefit at their

hands: notwithstanding our prognostications of the ephemeral nature of the system, it continued to increase in favour, and its disciples were to be found amongst the most intellectual and calm thinking members of society. We said to one another, what do these men give to their patients? One physician informed the writer that ~~Tartarized~~ Antimony in small doses, would act as a sufficient aperient, and doubtless that this was the preparation exhibited for the purpose in cases of constipated bowels. Ashamed is the author to confess, that he and others utterly ignorant of the subject, and refusing to inform themselves by actual experience, not merely suspected but asserted, that men of unimpeachable integrity gave ordinary drugs, under a feigned name, for the purpose of producing certain effects. In whatever else we differed, we cordially agreed in denouncing the entire system as quackery, delusion and imposture, and as a necessary consequence, excluded its professional advocates from our societies, whether scientific or social. We did not stop to ask, whether there was or was not *truth* in Hahnemann's proposition, if there existed a *law* for the administration of medicines, but our vials of wrath and contempt were poured upon the devoted heads of his followers, for the unpardonable innovation of administering drugs in inconceivably minute doses. We probably should not have evinced such an amount of irritation at the simple announcement of "*similia similibus curantur*," but to attempt to cure acute disease by such unheard of means was so absurd (thus we in our ignorance spoke and wrote), that none but fools or knaves would trouble themselves with the brief investigation, necessary to prove the falsity of Hahnemann's notions. We never could separate Hahnemann's law from infinitesimal doses, although we might have been informed by a tyro in homœopathy, that Hahnemann practised according to his promulgated law, for years ere he adopted the practice of minute doses. Without trying the effects of remedies upon this principle, we publicly declared the entire band of homœopathic practitioners, (most of whom held legal diplomas, many of them from our own Alma Mater), as unworthy of our society; by these acts we virtually if not really, asserted that they were banded together to propagate a delusion and a fraud. What a proof this was of our own

extreme credulity ! and of the “ characteristic obstinacy of the medical profession.”

The conscientious, highly educated and accomplished follower of Hahnemann, whose only object was to substitute in therapeutics, certainty for uncertainty, order for confusion ; this man, we repeat, was treated as a Pariah, an outcast. Homœopathy was always pronounced to be on the wane ; nevertheless, we found to our cost that it took from us our best patients ; we fondly hoped that these mis-guided people would after a little time return to their former orthodox creed and practice : but, no, they not only deserted us, our cathartics, sudorifics, alteratives, derivatives, blisterings, bleedings, et illud genus omne ; but charmed with the superiority of their new favourite, in the most unkind manner, they persuaded others to follow their example. The homœopaths were bold enough to open a dispensary, and strange to behold, the *poor* flocked to it ; we had comforted ourselves in the belief that, whatever whim the aristocracy might choose to pursue, the *poor* would certainly not become converts.

The young and talented members of our schools of medicine embraced and enthusiastically advocated the principles and practices of homœopathy, and asked us to explain how it was that the proportional recoveries of cases of Asiatic cholera and pneumonia, (*proved* to be such, not merely by the advocates, but likewise by the *opponents* of homœopathy), in Dr. Fleischmann’s hospital, at Vienna, so far outnumbered those of the allœopathic or old school practitioners. These figures were extremely awkward, *we* were comparatively powerless in the treatment of Asiatic cholera, at least in its advanced stages ; whilst the homœopathists were often successful. The Vienna hospital was a public institution, any physician might visit it, and not only ascertain the truth or falsehood of the statistical returns, but also see the effects of the infinitesimal doses. We *would not* be convinced. Not being able to *deny* the recoveries, we attributed them to the more healthy site of the hospital, the more abundant supply of attentive nurses and of comforts to the sick, and with these so called reasons we dismissed the statistics of cholera. Those of pneumonia remain to be accounted for : we satisfied ourselves with asserting that Fleischmann was not skilled in auscultation, that slight

cases of bronchitis would be set down as pneumonia and be classed amongst its cures. Mr. Wilde, a surgeon, editor of the *Dublin Quarterly Journal*, and author of the work "Austria and its Institutions," who is not a homœopathist, states that he witnessed the treatment of cases of pneumonia in Fleischmann's hospital, and that these cases were as acute and virulent, as those which had come under his observation elsewhere; that whilst the mortality for 1838 was not more than five or six per cent., three similar institutions on the alloëopathic plan shewed a mortality as high as from eight to ten per cent.

In answer to this and the testimony of Dr. Balfour, as published in the *British and Foreign Quarterly Review*, we comforted ourselves that pneumonia was curable without drugs, that this was the secret of the cure, and not the administration of homœopathic preparations. A little reflection would have convinced us that this was a somewhat dangerous argument to broach, by men ordering calomel, opium, tartar emetic, leeches, venesection, blistering, &c. &c., for however disposed we were to talk thus amongst ourselves, we never adopted the *laissez-faire* mode of practice when our patients required our professional assistance. And it cannot be denied that such arguments (if they be worthy of the name) were they sound ones, tell more against alloëopathy and its advocates, than against Hahnemann and his followers, inasmuch as the former used violent means which they consider to be unnecessary. Such a mode of reasoning has been not unaptly likened to a man passing a sword through his own vitals, in order to injure his adversary. But *any* testimony, however strong, however clear, was unavailing to us; the mists of prejudice, deep-rooted inveterate prejudice shrouded our mental vision as with Egyptian darkness; every misrepresentation was had recourse to, and satisfied us; we despised homœopathy, called Hahnemann a cheat and a nostrum vender, eagerly clutching at a non-authenticated piece of gossip, and delivering upon this a verdict, the evidence for which would have been deemed insufficient by any twelve intelligent and unprejudiced persons, and which, even if it had been true, could not have tested the merits or demerits of the homœopathic law. Had we really been desirous of knowing Hahnemann's character,

in its moral as well as its professional relation, we could have been sufficiently informed by men of reputation, his contemporaries—yet not homœopathists.

Marmaduke Sampson, Esq., in his very able essay entitled—*Truths and their reception, considered in relation to the doctrine of Homœopathy*, (a work as well as others of the same talented writer, by which the writer's impressions upon the subject were greatly strengthened) has collected a number of testimonials from well known persons in various parts of Europe.

The venerable Hufeland, acknowledged the highest personal respect for Hahnemann. Valentine Mott, the eminent American surgeon, says:—"Hahnemann is one of the most accomplished and *scientific* physicians of the present age." Dr. Uwins and Mr. Kingdon, of London, considered that Hahnemann was worthy of the thanks of the profession, for his unwearied industry in ascertaining the properties of medicines.

Dr. Sigmond speaks of him as a man of high intellectual attainments, of great sagacity, of inflexible courage, and of unwearied industry.

Dr. Forbes bears a similar testimony, and we are inclined to think that the evidence of these gentlemen is sufficient for the purpose.

The author's suspicions that homœopathic medicines had really some action, were first awakened in 1844, by one of his patients, an Oxford student, calling upon him during the long vacation. This young gentleman had been for several years under his care for a heart affection, which had caused himself and his family considerable anxiety. Consultations had been held with practitioners of high standing in Edinburgh, and he had been actively treated *secundum artem*, by depletions, digitalis, counter-irritants, &c. &c. He told the writer that since he had last seen him, he had been under the care of an homœopathic physician. "Well," was his but ill-pleased Doctor's reply, "you did not experience any effects from his sugar-plums!" "Pardon me, Doctor, the effects were very perceptible." This answer appeared somewhat strange: is it possible that a decillionth of aconite can produce any sensible effect? He passed away to Oxford, his

physician remaining unconvinced, attributing the consequences of the remedies to something given clandestinely: a refuge to which he and those like minded with him, invariably betook themselves, and he remained obstinate, notwithstanding that his patients continued to desert him for the homœopathic practitioner. Occasionally we heard of a death occurring in the practice of our rivals. This furnished ample scope for our eloquence. The man has been murdered! a case of inflammation has terminated in death! of course, what could be expected,—the man was not bled; we spoke and wrote as though a fatal termination was a *novelty* amongst us Solons of the allœopathic school. Then one of our brethren exulted over a performance of his own, which we all maintained satisfactorily settled the question of the action of infinitesimal doses. This worthy doctor actually did a homœopathic physician the honour of sitting at the same table with him, at the house of a mutual friend; their worthy host's hospitality had the effect of somewhat dispelling the frigidity of the worthy allœopath, who, after dinner, accosted his erring brother, and asked him for an inspection of his pocket medicine case: it was immediately handed to him. Selecting the tube labelled *nux vomica*, he had the hardihood to pour the contents into his palm and swallowed them, looking for the approving smiles of the assembled guests. This was too good an incident to be lost, we in our absolute wisdom proclaimed it far and wide. Do you *still* persist in believing that these globules contain what they profess to do; if they really consisted of *nux vomica*, do you not suppose that some visible result would have followed the swallowing of so many? These were the queries put to our homœopathic unprofessional friends, *unprofessional*, observe, for otherwise the solution of the apparent difficulty would have been very easy. For it is only under certain *morbid* conditions that these medicines act by their peculiar affinities. A child, at the time not susceptible of the disease, may be exposed to the contagion of scarlatina, small-pox, or other of the exanthemata without contracting the disease; yet a similar exposure a month afterwards, may be followed by the development of the malady: or three men might be bitten by the same rabid dog, and but one of them

sicken with hydrophobia; would any one from this deny the malignity of the virus? Besides it is a well ascertained fact that small doses of medicinal substances will frequently produce more powerful effects than larger quantities of them. To test the action of infinitesimal doses is purely a matter of experience, and it is in the power of any one to satisfy himself on the subject. We also attributed the so-called cures to the effect of imagination: although many cases of recovery from acute diseases, in children, could not with any fairness be attributed either to mental or moral causes: but the fact was, we *would* not allow that homœopathy could cure, and it was therefore settled by us that it *should* not. All cures were attributed to any cause but the right one, although recoveries under allopathic remedies were readily enough allowed to be the effect of the remedies employed, nor in spite of our assertions that diet alone would cure disease, did we ever trust to it exclusively in severe maladies. The press now began vigorously to send forth its productions upon the subject; but, although a reader of the surprising effects narrated, scepticism was yet in the ascendant. In the summer of 1848, the writer was led by circumstances to join a highly respectable practitioner in Alnwick, and he with great regret left Edinburgh. In the quiet locality to which he now removed, he ceased to think of homœopathy, and hoped to pursue his vocation unmolested by that pestilent heresy; although, occasionally meeting with it amongst the higher classes of society, nothing else in the town or neighbourhood induced him to pay any greater attention to its claims; nor indeed, to trouble himself about it at all, further than to lend to the few who advocated its principles, certain publications opposed to them. But, he could not avoid reading of the opening of hospitals for the reception of patients labouring under acute disease, and of the invitation to the medical profession to witness their treatment. This course of proceeding seemed to be a somewhat unusual one for quacks to pursue, and besides this, ever and anon, he received communications from friends and former patients, many of whom he knew to have been once opposed to homœopathy, but who now informed him of the benefit which they had received from it. He also observed that the number of well educated medical practitioners

practising upon the homœopathic principle, was yearly on the increase. He remembered that when a student at the *Ecole de Medicine* in 1831, there was but *one* homœopathic practitioner in Paris, Dr. Quin, and that he removed to London. Contrasting that state of things with the present (1849), he remarked that in London there were upwards of thirty homœopathic practitioners; in Paris a considerable number; throughout Germany, its birth place, and under the sanction of the reigning powers, it was rapidly increasing; that in America, they were to be counted by hundreds. That amongst these practitioners were men of unquestionable character and reputation, many of whom had for many years successfully practised according to the old system, and many others who determined to try whether there was any, and how much truth existed in it, had their doubts removed so far as to there being action in the infinitesimal doses. Space will not allow of the writer's giving a list of them, he will mention the names of some in Britain:—Dr. Uwins, Mr. Kingdon, Dr. Millingen, and Professor Liston, in London; Professor Henderson, in Edinburgh; Mr. Ramsbotham, Mr. Smith, and Dr. Wright, in Huddersfield: the three latter adopting its practice exclusively. Dr. Uwins and Mr. Kingdon brought the subject before the London Medical Society, the latter detailing several cases in which the homœopathic remedies were of signal service. The thanks which these gentlemen received for their attempt to diffuse information upon this subject amongst their brethren in a legitimate manner, were rudeness and reprobation. Dr. Uwins was assailed as a madman, and when Mr. Kingdon had concluded his interesting paper, one member said that—"he thought that all homœopathized patients were cured by nature"—another that he did not believe in it—and a third, that "it was all humbug;" and as an appropriate finale to the proceedings of this meeting of philosophers, a tacit understanding was come to, that the subject *should never again be mooted in that assembly*. The author found that the profession in Edinburgh and London resembled each other in the opposition which it offered to a proposed improvement in therapeutics. He acknowledges, that so far as he is concerned, he was as much to blame as any of them; and the only reparation which he has it

in his power to make, is this confession of the melancholy fact. These circumstances coupled with the increasing want of confidence in the ordinary practice, led him to the determination of *secretly* testing the monster, and of publishing the results of his trials. He believed that by so doing, he should be convinced of the fallacies of homœopathy, and that any doubts of their existence would be speedily dispelled, and his mind set at rest. His determination to test it was strengthened by attentively considering the letter of his late ever to be lamented friend, Dr. Andrew Combe, whose writings are so widely known and so justly appreciated in Europe and America. Dr. Combe had no cause to serve but that of truth. Truthfulness was his characteristic. The writer knew but too well, that so far as the uncertainty of medicine was concerned, he could scarcely be worse off, for professional intercourse (and this was considerable) with many eminent practitioners, had not tended to increase his confidence in drugs nor in medicine generally; nor did Dr. Forbes give him comfort, when he issued his celebrated number of the *British and Foreign Review*, containing the well known article entitled—"Homœopathy, Allopathy, and Young Physic." In order to take his first step with every precaution, the writer acquainted his friend Dr. Russell of Edinburgh with his difficulties, and received from that gentleman every direction for the proper investigation of the homœopathic practice; he likewise went to Newcastle and introduced himself to Dr. Hayle, who received him with his wonted urbanity, and advised him, if he wished to be speedily convinced of the *power* and efficacy of homœopathic preparations, to select for trial *acute* cases of disease. He returned and commenced his investigations, carrying them on in such a manner, that with scarce an exception, his patients were ignorant of his proceedings, and did not suspect any deviation from ordinary practice, save that they were agreeably surprised to find themselves cured and relieved by medicines tasteless and colourless. The result of his first trials utterly confounded him. Acute inflammatory cases, of such a description, as are by consent of all authorities in medicine, ordered or recommended to be treated by bleeding, either general or local, and other debilitating measures, yielded

much sooner to the homœopathic remedies appropriate to each case. One of the earliest of these was the following instance of

Bronchitis.

Mr. P.'s infant, aged six months, residing two miles from Alnwick, was seized on the 26th of March, 1850, with cough and dyspnœa; attended with thirst, hot skin, and quick pulse. Domestic remedies, such as antimonials, castor oil, friction with Bow's liniment, had been resorted to, but as the symptoms increased in intensity, I was hurriedly sent for, early on the morning of the 29th, and found the infant lying exhausted in her mother's lap, suffering from cough, short, harsh, dry, and constant in its character; dyspnœa urgent, the nostrils dilating widely at each inspiration, skin hot, the pulse much accelerated; she could not take the breast. Tinct. Aconiti and Ipecacuanhæ, one drop of each was ordered to be given alternately every quarter of an hour. Relief was afforded within an hour. A messenger was sent to me, to prevent a repetition of my visit in the evening. I saw her the next morning, and ordered her Hepar sulph. This completed the cure. She did not require a third visit.

When I prescribed for this case, it was with the determination that it should be the experimentum crucis; and that if a mitigation of the child's sufferings did not speedily take place, I would abandon the homœopathic treatment, and resort to the old system of leeching, emetics, &c. &c. Neither imagination nor diet could have had any share in the recovery; for the patient was an infant, and its only diet its mother's milk; and the same remarks will apply to another case, occurring at the beginning of this year.

Mr. B.'s infant, aged six months, a stout plethoric child, was taken ill on the 20th of January, 1851, with cough and febrile symptoms. I saw him on the 22nd, the cough was dry and constant, face flushed, hot skin, quick pulse, and constant thirst. Tinct. Aconiti and Bryoniæ, one drop of each was ordered to be given alternately every half an hour. The patient was relieved before the evening.

January 25th.—The cough being still somewhat troublesome, and accompanied with mucous râles over the chest, Tinct. Ipecacuanhæ, gtt. vj. was given in divided doses: the child required no further treatment.

A third case affecting the respiratory organs likewise occurring in a child, who knew nothing of homœopathy, shall here be inserted.

I was sent for on the 30th of September, 1850, to see Miss M. R.

æet 12, who was affected with bronchial irritation, fever, headache, and spasmodic cough. Aconite was taken throughout the day, in one drop doses. My opinion given to her sister was, that something more serious than ordinary cough was impending. Tinct. Bryoniæ was administered the following day; in two days, whooping cough was fully developed; Tinct. of Nux vomica was now prescribed in drop doses, and this had a marked effect upon the character of the cough: in ten days she was quite well and returned to school. No other medicines than the above-mentioned were administered. A slight return of the cough took place after exposure to a cold east wind, but Ipecacuanha in one drop doses gave relief within two days.

Another case of a different character tended to make him still more satisfied with the superiority of homœopathie practice.

Cerebral Convulsions.

On the 30th of January, 1851, I was requested to visit Mr. H.'s son, aged 13 months: he had been seized previous to my arrival, or that of another practitioner, (who in my absence had been sent for,) with general spasms of a violent character, accompanied by insensibility. The muscles of the face I was informed had been distorted, and the thumbs turned inwards towards the palms. When I saw him the face was very pale, and covered with a cold sweat; the gums were swollen from the pressure of the molar teeth upon them. I scarified the gums, ordered cold to be applied to the head, and administered Tinct. Belladonna, one drop.

31st.—Has had a restless night, continued thirst, at noon the convulsions returned.

Ordered Tinct. Ignatiæ one drop, to be taken immediately, and Tinct. Coffæ one drop, to be administered in the evening for the purpose of producing sleep. From this time the spasms did not return, and convalescence rapidly took place. The teeth did not pierce the gums for several weeks afterwards, so that very little if any benefit, could have arisen from the scarification of the gums, and I did not resort to it in the second case of difficult dentition occurring in Mr. S.'s child, aged 11 months. He was suffering from cough, hoarseness, hot skin, thirst, and restlessness; the eyelids were glued together with muco-purulent matter, and he was much griped. Castor oil had been given to him before I was sent for. Ordered Nux-vomica, two globules, third dilut., to be taken every four hours. The next day I found him much relieved; excessive thirst was his chief ailment. Chamomilla was ordered, and the child was convalescent on the following day.

The efficacy of minute doses of Chamomile, is strikingly exemplified in the two following cases :

Mrs. P.'s child was seized (without any evident cause) on the evening of February 7th, with pain of abdomen and vomiting. Chamomile two drops, in divided doses, was all that was required to relieve him.

The second case was Mrs. A.'s child, who sent for me on the evening of April 21st, 1850. He was complaining of pain in the stomach, accompanied by vomiting; the cause assigned was eating "early greens." One drop of the Tinct. Chamomil., gave immediate relief.

So soon as I was convinced that the homœopathic preparations, administered according to the homœopathic law, were more efficacious in curing acute cases of disease than the old method of practice, I corresponded with several of my medical friends of the allœopathic school, mentioned my experience on the subject, and requested their opinions. *Not one met the case on its merits*; one ridiculed the idea that such effects could possibly result from a decillionth of aconite, &c.; another dismissed the subject very summarily by saying, that "he knew nothing whatever of homœopathy, but that he considered the administering of such small doses in really dangerous cases to be a trifling with human life;" another's response was to this effect—"I have seen some narrow escapes from homœopathic treatment." One friend, whilst opposing homœopathy, made this somewhat remarkable admission—"I have no doubt but that patients will get well sooner under the homœopathic treatment;" a fourth saw no objections to my continuing the investigation secretly, believing that a return to my "first love" would be the result of a more extended experience.

Several of my patients of the higher ranks asked me whether I was practising homœopathically. I replied in the affirmative, but added, that as yet my mind was not sufficiently decided upon the matter; they did not care how I treated them providing I did so conscientiously; and all my medical correspondents urged me not to proclaim my "perversion" (so they termed it) until a few months longer should have passed away.

The following cases are a few selected during those months of probation.

Scarlatina.

Mrs. L., near Alnwick, sent for me on the 20th of August, 1850, to see her niece. I found her labouring under a smart attack of scarlatina, with swelling and redness of the tonsils and fauces. Belladonna Tr., six drops, was all that was required to cure her; her recovery was so rapid and complete that it was only requisite for me to see her twice.

The cases which follow occurred in adult subjects; they did not, with one or two exceptions, suspect me of any homœopathic tendencies, they having formerly heard me express myself strongly against it. Imagination, therefore, cannot be considered an element in the result; but let it be borne in mind that there was no concealment on my part when questioned.

Hemiplegia with Cerebral Congestion.

D. T., Esq., aged 62, residing four miles from Alnwick, has had two attacks of paralysis in Edinburgh; he is now hemiplegic. On April 20, 1850, I was summoned to see him. He complained of headache and noise in the ears; the eyes were dull; the conjunctiva injected; pulse 90, full and bounding. He presented the same appearance (so Mrs. T. informed me) prior to his last attack; he has been accustomed to take Colocynt pills for the purpose of relieving constipation. Lachesis, six doses, of three globules each, relieved him in a week, and his health has been uninterrupted (with the exception of his hemiplegic constitution) ever since.

Congestive Headache and Catarrhal Ophthalmia.

Miss — had for some years suffered the infliction of an issue in one leg, in order to avert headache and ophthalmia (which desirable result, however, it failed to produce). At my recommendation the issue was healed. Pulsatilla gave her relief. The ophthalmia does not return, and the headache is much less severe in its character.

Catarrhal Ophthalmia, with Ulcer of the Cornea.

Miss — sent for me to Alnemouth, July 18, 1850. She was suffering from inflammation of the conjunctivæ, accompanied by a febrile state, profuse lachrymation, and intolerance of light. On the right cornea was a small ulcer. Aeonite and Belladonna were the remedies at first employed; afterwards, Sulphur, Calcarea, and Silicea. She completely recovered.

Bronchitis.

Miss K. was seized on the 19th of March, 1850, with severe frontal headache; pain in the sternum; increased by deep inspiration; frequent hard cough without expectoration; quick pulse; thirst, and hot skin. Aconite and Bryonia were administered alternately every three hours. Before the expiration of twelve hours, a marked remission of the symptoms took place, followed by refreshing sleep. Mercurius, Sulphur and China, were the only additional remedies resorted to.

Cynanche Tonsillaris.

Elizabeth R., aged 21, was suffering on January 14, 1851, from inflammation and swelling of the cellular membrane of the fauces and tonsils, accompanied by fever, difficulty of swallowing and speaking. Aconite and Baryta carbonica cured her in twelve hours.

Gastrodynia.

Isabella S. is subject to pain in the stomach after eating, with occasional vomiting of food. Pulsatilla, Sulphur, and Baryta carbonica cured her: up to the time of my last seeing her (eleven months having elapsed) there has not been any return of the disorder.

Gastrodynia and Hematemesis.

C. B., a servant girl, left her place on account of severe and continued pain in the stomach, accompanied by frequent vomiting of food. She had been under medical treatment, and had swallowed a large quantity and a considerable variety of drugs without deriving any relief. She had resided in the country for six weeks with her mother when I first saw her, on the 22nd of December, 1850, but was not better. Pulsatilla immediately relieved her, and followed by Sepia, completed the cure. Three months afterwards she went to service in the country; her complaint returned, and in addition to the former symptoms, she threw up a large quantity of dark grumous blood. I ordered her Bryonia, which completely relieved her.

Dyspepsia, Anorexia, and Vomiting of coffee-coloured fluid.

Miss — has been the subject of this affection for several years; she is opposed to homœopathy, but I persuaded her to try Nuxvomica, which gave her greater relief than any former remedy.

If imagination had any influence in this case, it certainly was not exerted in favour of homœopathy.

Vomiting and Acute Pain in the Stomach.

Miss —— residing some miles from Alnwick, was seized on the night of January 17th, 1851, with constant vomiting and violent pain in the epigastric region, increased on pressure. She attributed her illness to having eaten boiled greens at dinner. Repeated draughts of tepid water emptied the stomach, but nothing except bile was ejected. I saw her at 3 A.M. and gave her Chamomilla Tr., one drop; two doses of this relieved her. The next day, on account of headache, Pulsatilla was given, and three doses of Sulphur on the following day; convalescence was then complete.

Gastrodynia and Vomiting of Food.

Miss —— residing in the country five miles from Alnwick, has for a long time been subject to anorexia, pain in the stomach after eating, and headache. She has during this period become emaciated and desponding.

I saw her on the 18th of January, 1851, and ordered her three doses of Sulphur, followed by Scpia, twelve doses.

27th.—Saw her again. The appetite has improved; pain of stomach has ceased; vomiting occurs more rarely.

Feb. 4.—Continued improvement; complains only of debility. Ferrum, eight doses.

Neither pain nor vomiting has returned up to this date, March 21st.

Cholera Britannica.

Several cases of this affection came under my treatment in May, 1850. I have selected for illustration the following.

Miss B., aged 14, was attacked on the 12th of May, 1850, with vomiting, purging and tenesmus, hot skin, quick pulse and thirst. Belladonna, Antimonium, Rhubarb, Sulphur, Nux vomica and Calcareia, were administered in succession. Her convalescence was complete in eight days, not requiring tonics to restore strength.

The disorder was epidemic, and under the ordinary treatment was much longer in its duration.

Miss B., a phthisical subject, was seized, on the 9th of August, 1850, with vomiting, purging, accompanied with coldness of the extremities. Veratrum and Arsenicum were given, and she was convalescent on the 14th.

Mr. —— brother of this lady, was taken ill with somewhat similar symptoms on the 11th of August. Mercurius restored him in two days.

Miss G. was seized, on October 31st, 1850, with the ordinary

symptoms of autumnal cholera, attended by smart fever, face flushed, pulse 110. Aeonite, Veratrum, Arsenicum and Ipecac., relieved her in four days, and she regained strength immediately without any other drugs.

I could add several similar cases, one of a lady, aged 80, but it is unnecessary. I will merely remark, that, with one exception, all were alike ignorant of their being the subjects of homœopathic treatment.

Pleurisy.

Mrs. R., residing two miles from Alnwick, was seized on January 19, 1850, with pleurisy of the right side of the chest; respiration much impeded; pulse strong and frequent; hot skin, with thirst. Aeonite and Arnica alternated relieved her in two hours. The cough yielded in a day or two to Ipecac.

Neuralgia Facialis.

Miss — has been for years subject to severe attacks of faeial neuralgia, accompanied by swelling and redness of the lining membrane of the mouth. She had been treated by leeches and various remedies, but the paroxysms yielded slowly, and great prostration of strength was the invariable consequence. I was called to see her on the 17th of March, 1850, and ordered her Belladonna, three globules every quarter of an hour; within two hours, relief was afforded, and the cure was completed by Arsenicum, succeeded by Graphites. No tonic nor any other remedy was required, as had been the case invariably after former attacks.

A lady who knew of the preceding case sent for me; she was suffering in a similar way; she suspected that homœopathic remedies had been employed upon her friend. I told her that her suspicions were correct. She was not anxious to have them used in her own case, but I overcame her scruples; her thankfulness and surprise for the complete and speedy relief afforded by Belladonna was to me most gratifying.

AFFCTIONS PECULIAR TO FEMALES.

Threatened Abortion.

Mrs. A. (who had previously miscarried at about the same period), was about thirteen weeks advanced in pregnancy. She was seized on the night of Sunday, April 9th, 1850, with bearing-down pains, and sanguineous discharge. Homœopathic preparations and doses of Belladonna, Aeonite and Opium, cured her, and gestation went on to the full period.

Puerperal Inflammation.

Mrs. G. was seized on June 23rd, ten days after delivery, (under the superintendence of a midwife), with shivering and pain in the uterine region, increased on pressure, attended with suppression of the lochia, and mammary secretion. Tongue was red and glazed,—pulse 110, with constant thirst; anxiety and suffering were depicted in her countenance. Aconite, Chamomilla, Nux vomica, and Calcarea, were successively administered. She was convalescent on the 30th, and has continued to nurse her infant.

Odontalgia.

Several cases of almost instantaneous relief have occurred to me; I will relate the particulars of only one.

I was called to Master B., suffering from violent tooth-ache, arising from two decayed molars, in the right side of the upper jaw: the gums were hot and swollen. Belladonna and Aconite taken alternately every quarter of an hour, afforded speedy and permanent relief, and extraction by the surgeon was rendered unnecessary.

It would occupy too much space to give details of many *chronic cases* in which I was satisfied of the superiority of the homœopathic practice. In diseases peculiar to women and children, in the protean forms of hysteria and dyspepsia, (some of the latter affections we have reported already,) we have in our materia medica resources of the most satisfactory kind. In one case always present to my mind, the sufferer who had for long been the victim of daily and nightly opiates, has not for more than twelve months taken a particle of this drug, pain and restlessness having been most effectually relieved by homœopathic preparations *alone*. Those conversant with the distressing sequelæ of opiates, can readily appreciate the greatness of such a boon.

One case of anasarca I will relate, simply because the subject of it, a man aged 65, had been under allœopathic treatment without gaining any relief by it.

When I first saw him, his legs and feet were very much swollen, and œdematous, ascites likewise existed. The urine was scanty, and of a deep red colour. After taking Bryonia Tinct., one drop twice in the day, followed by Pulsatilla in the same doses, the swelling almost *entirely* disappeared.

Profuse discharge of mucus from the nostrils.

A lady the subject of this troublesome affection, consulted me respecting it. She was cured by two doses of *Nux vomica*.

Rheumatism and Sciatica.

Thomas R., aged 45, had been confined to the house for two weeks, but had suffered from rheumatism for some weeks prior to his keeping within doors. I found him unable to walk, complaining of muscular pains in the back and loins, with severe pain down the course of the sciatic nerve. Two days after taking as many doses of *Bryonia*, he was at his out-door work, and has continued to work ever since.

Had I continued to entertain doubts upon the reality of action in homœopathic remedies, this would have been removed by the following proof.

I gave a lady for a chronic affection, *Mercurius* 9 globules, divided into three doses; upon calling upon her a few days afterwards, she told me that salivation had ensued.

Let it be remarked that she was ignorant of the remedy prescribed, and moreover believed that homœopathic medicines were inert.

The foregoing cases then, each one treated by myself alone, convinced me that all my pre-conceived opinions upon homœopathy were erroneous, for it was to the *action* of the remedies administered that the results were due.

The *diet* was not altered in the case of children at the breast, nor in the cases of those adults unconscious of my treatment could *imagination* have exerted the slightest influence?

But even if these powerful auxiliaries have assigned to them an undue share of influence, I would ask my allœopathic brethren, whether they believe that *imagination* will cure cases of acute disease, the rapid subsidence of which, under homœopathic remedies is astonishing, and can be attested by thousands. Or will diet, however restricted and well regulated, be effectual for the same desirable end, (and let it be observed, that in the two cases of infantile bronchitis which have been detailed, no alteration of diet could have been made), and the disease only began to yield (and then did so) upon the administration of the homœopathic medicines. But if this line of argument be per-

sisted in by our brethren, or the assertion that the *vis medicatrix naturæ* is the cause of recovery, we reply—be consistent then, do not continue to administer the nauseous and hurtful compounds to your unhappy patients, if you think that the disease can be removed by the combined influences of diet, imagination, and nature; do not injure their stomachs by calomel, jalap, and other potent drugs; nor resort to bleeding, blistering, nor such like violent measures. Surely, those who in sincerity advance such arguments, would do well to ponder, whether they may not easily be turned against themselves, and the subjects of such unpleasant experiments may with reason say,—gentlemen, leave us to the more agreeable remedies of imagination, diet, and nature.

But we have been not a little surprised of late, to find that the once oft re-iterated objection to the employment of homœopathic remedies in acute and dangerous cases, has been succeeded by attempts to frighten our patients, by telling them, that although the seat of disease may be, and is reached by homœopathic remedies, (for the evidence of this is beyond dispute,) yet, that this is effected at the expense of the constitution. Some of my patients informed me, that medical men told them by way of warning, that the homœopathic medicines were virulent poisons, and that although they removed disease, undermined the patient's system, and shortened his life! One lady assured me so, and another was told that if she persisted in taking the remedies which I prescribed for her, she would die suddenly. Happily these ladies (who were both my patients), were women possessed of ability and will to exercise their reasoning powers, and therefore they disregarded such ridiculous modes of setting aside the question. We told them that if the remedies *were* poisons, doctors of the old school administered the same in much larger quantities: also that Hahnemann who proved so many medicines upon himself, lived to the age of eighty-nine.

A lady, the sister of a friend of mine, a highly respectable homœopathic physician, was gravely told by a gentleman in large practice, that a pain in the region of the heart, with which a lady is troubled, has been caused by the Belladonna given to her by this physician; at another time this same practitioner asserted that this very Belladonna was "nothing."

Strange indeed it is that such contradictory assertions should be made, but we must leave the task of reconciling their discrepancies to the authors themselves.

But another objection is also started, viz., that the majority of the profession is opposed to it; so were the London College of Physicians to Harvey's doctrine of the circulation of the blood. Vaccination likewise was received with distrust, and was opposed. Mr. Sampson in the work before quoted, has shown how those of authority in various departments, such as banking, the post office, the law, have ever been the active opponents of measures of undoubted reform affecting their own vocation, and that therefore it cannot be a matter of surprise that (for reasons easily divined) homœopathy should meet with a similar reception from members of the medical profession.

It is not to the credit of our island, that while the doctrines of homœopathy have arrested the attention and become the study of many learned and experienced medical men in Europe and America, Great Britain is the only country where it has been noticed only to draw forth the most opprobrious invectives. It will not be satisfactory to assert that Hahnemann's theory is absurd and novel. Dr. Millingen (not a homœopathist) asserts in his "Curiosities of Medical Experience," "that Hippocrates laid down in his aphorisms the incontrovertible fact, *duobus doloribus simal obortis, non tandem eâdem in parte, vehementur alterum obscurat*," A. 46. To a certain degree it was upon this assertion, which the experience of ages has confirmed, that Hahnemann founded the principal and most important point of his doctrine; but going much farther than the Father of Medicine, he affirms that similar diseases effectually remove each other. For centuries practitioners have been acting homœopathically; the exhibition of specifics in fact, being nothing else. Specifics are known to produce symptoms similar to the diseases they cure. To increase the number of these specifics has been the laborious and singular study of Hahnemann and his disciples, a study of which Haller had first given the example; and the same author justly states, "that our safest, perhaps our sole guide in the study of disease, is the group of symptoms, that become more and more perceptible during the course of our investigations." Even were

we to discard the theory, we cannot so deal with facts. Let us not care so much about the correctness of his theory, (for the history of medicine affords the almost constant substitution of one theory for another,) as the *success* of the practice. I ask the unprejudiced medical enquirer, to read attentively the "Essay on the homœopathic treatment of the Asiatic Cholera," and the "Narrative of a mission to Ireland during the famine and pestilence of 1847," by Joseph Kidd, surgeon.

Those essays will be found in a volume published under the superintendence of the British Homœopathic Association, by Samuel Highley, 32, Fleet Street, London.

What were Mr. Kidd's auxiliaries for treating the malignant typhus, and yet how marked was his success, as proved by the convincing testimony of clergymen and others who had no interest whatever in supporting the homœopathic practice?

The writer's own experience for nearly eighteen months, the irresistible evidence brought under his notice in his researches made alike in the writings of those opposed as well as of those favourable to homœopathy, furnished facts upon facts, until an overwhelming array presented themselves. He felt that although there was nothing to prevent his continuing to practise how and in what manner he chose, he was fully convinced that the homœopathic principle was the correct one, and that his own success in practice upon that principle was the most marked in the history of his professional life; he felt that the only honest course to adopt, was the avowal of his belief. He knew that by so doing he would draw down upon him the anger of his former professional friends, that would for a time at least, endanger his professional reputation, and separate him from all existing professional ties. On the other hand, he dared not relinquish those remedies, the mode of administering which he had found so efficacious in curing rapidly and safely so many forms of disorders. He was told that to avow himself an homœopathist, would be to take a step fatal to his reputation as a scientific physician, but the words of Dr. Baillie (as truly a scientific man as any of his successors) were strongly impressed upon his mind, "tell me what will do my patients good, and I will give it to them." Estimating so highly as he does the homœopathic practice, it

will not be considered a matter for surprise that he should consider it his duty resolutely to defend it, and diligently to propagate it, and this he is determined to do, uninfluenced by the frowns or even threats of those with whom he was not long since on terms of intimate friendship. His only wish is the removal of the prejudice which prevents their investigating the subject; an investigation, which if pursued with a determination to arrive at the truth, he is convinced must result in a firm belief of the greater certainty, and therefore incalculable superiority of the homœopathic practice in the removal of disease: or if this be not practicable, at least, of the more effective relief of suffering.

To call Hahnemann and his followers quacks, is merely to say that which is false. A system of therapeutics which is based upon observation and experience, which has been tested by various persons in different parts of the globe; these persons publishing to the world the results of their investigations, these results agreeing remarkably with one another, can this with justice be called quackery? It pretends not to possess a universal remedy for the various ills that flesh is heir to; it does not conceal its remedies, on the contrary, it publishes them without reserve, and invites all the members of the medical profession to test its truth or its falsehood for themselves. Take Aconite for example, in infinitesimal doses, administer it as we have frequently done to an infant at the breast, so as to exclude any supposed effect of the imagination, it will be found to be an indisputable fact, that this medicine in this very minute dose, will subdue inflammatory action more effectually, more quickly, more safely, than any other known means. Every practitioner may convince himself of the truth of this assertion. It was the testimony of so many enlightened and honest men, professional and unprofessional, that first led me to investigate the subject, and others I believe will from similar reasons, be led to adopt a like course; what the result will be, it does not require to be told. Truth will prevail.

YORK, June 1851.